

OFFICIAL

SC  
#10 (NE)  
8/12-03

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116  
Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group Art Unit 2172

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Atty. Docket

RAYMOND KRASINSKI

US000284

Serial No. 09/699,609

Group Art Unit: 2172

Filed: OCTOBER 30, 2000

Examiner: A. KINDRED

TITLE: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR COMPRESSING TEXTUAL DOCUMENTS

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Arlington VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

AUG 07 2003

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Technology Center 2100

Sir:

This responds to the final Office Action of June 26, 2003. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application of which Claims 1, 11, 18, 19, 20, and 21 are independent claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 9-15, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,991,713 to Unger ("Unger") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,949 to Crandall ("Crandall"). Claims 7-8 and 16-17 were rejected under 35

PATENT  
Ser. No. 09/699,609

U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Unger and Crandall in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,820 to Dietz ("Dietz").<sup>1</sup>

Focusing on the rejection of Claim 1 in the Office Action based on Unger and Crandall, the Office Action acknowledges that Unger fails to teach the Claim 1 recitation of "wherein said document before and after the compressing step is in a given file format". Thus, the Office Action appears to rely on Crandall for purportedly supplying this missing element. However, the Office Action does not explicitly state this, nor does it analyze how Unger would be modified in view of Crandall to provide all of the recitations of Claim 1. Thus, the Office Action fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness. MPEP 706.02(j)

In addition, in view of what Crandall appears to fairly disclose, the combination of Unger and Crandall does not in fact present a prima facie case of obviousness: As previously noted in the Amendment mailed February 20, 2003, Unger teaches a system that takes a file having a first file format, such as HTML, compresses textual data from the file, and results, after compilation, in a second file having a

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner confirmed by telephone on August 1, 2003 that the correct patent number for Crandall is U.S. Patent No. 5,999,949 (i.e., the citation to U.S. Patent No. 5,991,949 in the Office Action is a typographical error). Also, Applicant does not appear to have received a copy of the PTO-892, but subsequently confirmed with the Examiner that only Crandall was newly cited. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a copy of PTO-892 with the next communication.

PATENT  
Ser. No. 09/699,609

second file format. Crandall teaches compressing and decompressing a text file (such as an ASCII file or the text portion of an HTML file) by creating a number of dictionary files and a word index, among other things. Because Unger already compresses textual data before compilation, Crandall's text compression does not provide additional teaching to Unger in this regard.

Thus, without conceding that such a combination is proper, modifying Unger in view of the text compression taught by Crandall would only result in what is already disclosed in Unger alone: A system that takes a file having a first file format, such as HTML, compresses textual data from the file, and results, after compilation, in a second file having a second file format. The second file format would still be analogous to that shown in Fig. 7 (ref. no. 52) of Unger.

Because Crandall adds nothing to Unger that isn't already there, the remarks given in the prior Amendment regarding the disadvantages of Unger apply equally to the combination of Unger and Crandall. For example, due to the change of format, the combination of Unger and Crandall would still require an intermediate program or a separate proxy server to translate the compiled document before it is readable in the first file format. In addition, the tags are altered in the file compressed file format of Unger and a correspondence table is

PATENT  
Ser. No. 09/699,609

created to preserve the relationship between the tags and corresponding text and objects.

Thus, without conceding that such a combination is proper, the combination of Unger and Crandall fails to provide (at least) the Claim 1 recitation of "wherein said document before and after the compressing step is in a given file format". Accordingly, the combination of Unger and Crandall fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to Claim 1. See, e.g., MPEP 2143.03.

Finally, even supposing hypothetically (but not conceding) that the combination of Unger and Crandall did result in the Claim 1 recitation of "wherein said document before and after the compressing step is in a given file format", the rationale given for combining Unger and Crandall in the Office Action is improper. The Office action states that such a combination would have been obvious "because using the [Claim 1 recitation] of "wherein said document before and after the compressing step is in a given file format", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to ability [sic] to process compressed and uncompress[ed] data regardless [of] the data format" and that "[t]his gives users the advantage of processing compressed/uncompressed data faster". (Office Action, ¶3 at p. 2) Thus, the only rationale given in the Office Action for combining Unger and Crandall is that the Claim 1 recitation of "wherein said document before and after the compressing step is in a given file

PATENT  
Ser. No. 09/699,609

format" would have provided certain purported benefits. This is not a proper rationale for combining the teachings of Unger and Crandall.<sup>2</sup> See MPEP 2143.01.

For at least the above-noted reasons, Claim 1 is patentably distinct from the combination of Unger and Crandall. Independent Claims 11, 18, 19, 20, and 21 are allowable for at least analogous reasons. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-17, they are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies on their respective independent claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of all claims in the Application, namely, Claims 1-21, is respectfully requested.

The Applicant has made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

---

<sup>2</sup> Apart from not providing a proper rationale, the statement of benefits in the Office Action are also unclear. That is, the statements "would have given those skilled in the art the tools to ability [sic] to process compressed and uncompress[ed] data regardless [of] the data format" and that "[t]his gives users the advantage of processing compressed/uncompressed data faster" are unclear.

OFFICIAL

PATENT  
Ser. No. 09/699,609

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By *Daniel E. Tierney*

Daniel E. Tierney, Reg. No. 33,461  
160 Hawkins Road  
Centereach, NY 11720  
631-588-4429

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

It is hereby certified that this correspondence  
is being facsimile transmitted to the United States  
Patent & Trademark Office at fax number 703-746-7238

On August 6, 2003  
(Date of Transmission)

By *Daniel E. Tierney*  
(Signature)

RECEIVED  
AUG 07 2003  
Technology Center 2100